

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of October 18, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 16, 17 and 19-52 have been amended. Claim 52 has been added. Claims 1-17 and 19-52 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Applicants' Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during the personal interview of January 23, 2007. Applicants agree with and adopt the Examiner's Interview Summary as an accurate description of the substance of interview, in conjunction with the following remarks, pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 4-7, 10-14, 21, 23-26, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 41 and 47-51.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 8-9, 16-18, 44 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,070,329, "Jasinaki") in view of Tat *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,225, "Tat") and further in view of Sayers *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237, "Sayers"). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinaki in view of Tat and Sayers and further in view of Prall (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0110233, "Prall"). Claims 19-20, 27-28, 31, 34, 40, 43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinaki in view of Tat. Claims 22 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinaki in view of Tat and further in view of Kalveram *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0023184, "Kalveram"). Claims 29, 30 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinaki in view of Tat and further in view of Drum *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,845, "Drum"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1, 19, 31 and 46 relate to, *inter alia*, digital broadcast transmission bursts and more generally, digital transmission of information. As agreed, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the transmissions are digital transmissions to overcome Jasinaki and to render Jasinaki an improper basis for rejection. As discussed during the personal interview of January 23, 2007, Jasinaki is merely directed to an analog pager system and as such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine digital transmissions and features thereof with the analog system described in Jasinaki. For example, claims 1 and 19 relate to a digital broadcast receiver configured to receive digital broadcast transmission bursts, while claims 31 and 46 relate to a digital broadcast transmitter configured to transmit digital broadcast transmission bursts. Since Jasinaki is directed toward communications using analog signals, there would have been no need or motivation to combine a digital broadcast receiver and/or transmitter with the teachings of Jasinaki. Without Jasinaki, the cited secondary references, even in combination, fail to teach each and every feature of claims 1, 19, 31 and 46. For example, none of the cited secondary references teach or suggest transmitting streaming information in synchronization with the power-up of a digital broadcast receiver. Claims 1, 19, 31 and 46 are thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-17, 20-30, 32-45 and 47-51 depend on claims 1, 19, 31 and 46 respectively and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New Claims

Claim 52 has been added. Claim 52 depends on claim 1 and thus incorporates all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 52 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 7th day of February, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu, Registration No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001